



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/553,734	10/20/2005	Takayoshi Tanizawa	HOK-0290	7774
74384	7590	10/08/2008		
Cheng Law Group, PLLC 1100 17th Street, N.W. Suite 503 Washington, DC 20036			EXAMINER DIXON, ANNETTE FREDRICKA	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3771	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/08/2008 PAPER	

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/553,734

**Applicant(s)**

TANIZAWA ET AL.

**Examiner**

Annette F. Dixon

**Art Unit**

3771

**Period for Reply** -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 July 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,5 and 8-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,5 and 8-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8/21/08
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to the amendment filed on July 28, 2008.

Examiner acknowledges claims 1, 2, 5, and 8-12 are pending in this application, with claims 3, 4, 6, and 7 having been cancelled.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1, 2, 5, 8, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) and (e) as being anticipated by Kikumoto et al. (2002/0068887).

As to Claim 1, Kikumoto discloses an apparatus wherein the recited method is inherent in the use of the apparatus. Kikumoto is an massage machine with a controlling massage program (Figures 7-12 and 15) having a plurality of massage stages with different massage parameters (defined in Figure 15) in a massage machine for providing a massage according to said massage program, said method comprising the steps of storing a change in massage parameter performed in a desired massage

stage during an execution of a massage program in memory, and modifying the desired message stage according to the change in message parameter stored in said memory at the next execution of said message program, wherein when a change in total time required for said message program occurs due to a change in message parameter in the desired message stage, the message parameter of another message stage corresponding to the message parameter changed in the desired message parameter is changed such that said message program is completed within a predetermined time, and wherein said memory comprises a memory table for storing a required number of message stages having a same message parameter, and when the desired message stage stored at a predetermined position in said memory table is deleted from said memory table, and the message parameter of said another message stage is deleted from said memory table is changed such that said message program is completed within a predetermined time period. (Figure 15 and Paragraphs 0066 thru 0074).

As to Claim 2, Kikumoto discloses the massage machine is a chair-type massage machine (Figures 1 and 2) having a back rest portion (13), in which a massage head for providing a massage action is incorporated (21), and said message parameters comprises the kind of massage action, range of massage action, the number of massage actions, massage strength, and massage speed. (Paragraphs 0068-0070).

As to Claim 5, Kikumoto discloses the required number of message stages having the same message parameter stored in said memory table (Figure 15, and Paragraphs 0022 and 0066) is a required number of message stages having a same number of message actions, and when the desired message stage is stored in said

memory table as a result of the change in the number of massage actions, another massage stage is stored at a predetermined position in said memory table is deleted from said memory table, and the number of massage actions of said another massage stage deleted from said memory table is changed such that said massage program is completed within a predetermined time period (Paragraph 0070 thru 0074).

As to Claim 8, the difference between Claim 1 and Claim 8 are the following limitations that are also disclosed by Kikumoto. Kikumoto discloses the range of massage action is a combination of ranges of massage action in width and height directions, the plurality of massage stages have at least one of the same massage action in the width direction and a same range of massage action in the height direction, and when a change in massage parameter performed in one of the massage stages is stored in said memory, the massage stages having at least one of the same range of massage action in the width direction and the same range of massage action in the height direction are modified in one lump according to the change in massage parameter stored in said memory at the next execution of said massage. Specifically, Kikumoto discloses a determination of the massage user's body frame (Figure 6), inherently this measurement of the frame of the user determines the operating ranges of massage action in the width and height directions.

As to Claim 9, Kikumoto discloses the range of massage action is a combination of ranges of massage action in width and height directions, the plurality of massage stages have at least one of the same massage action in the width direction and a same range of massage action in the height direction, and when a change in massage

Art Unit: 3771

parameter performed in one of the massage stages is stored in said memory, the massage stages having at least one of the same range of massage action in the width direction and the same range of massage action in the height direction are modified in one lump according to the change in massage parameter stored in said memory at the next execution of said massage. Specifically, Kikumoto discloses a determination of the massage user's body frame (Figure 6), inherently this measurement of the frame of the user determines the operating ranges of massage action in the width and height directions.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102/103***

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a/e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Kikumoto et al. (2002/0068887) in view of Cutler et al. (6,375,630).

As to Claims 10 and 12, Kikumoto discloses a memory system (Paragraph 00222 and 0066) wherein permanent software is stored as well as the temporary parameters of the massage machine user. Inherently, the ability to store permanent software and the temporary user parameters gives way to the use of ROM, RAM, and their variants. As known, ROM is read-only memory and is associated with firmware and software applications, while RAM is random access memory and is associated with temporary stored memory that may be lost after a power down. Thus, Kikumoto discloses a first memory for temporary storing a change in massage parameter, and a second memory for storing the change in massage parameter provided from the first memory after the completion of said massage program, a control unit (7) configured to control the massage program according to the method set forth in claim 1, wherein the controller is detachable to the massage machine, and comprises an input unit (Figure 5) configured to input the change in massage parameter and a screen (71) for displaying the massage parameter. However, should Applicant respectfully disagree, Examiner provides prior art Cutler. Cutler teaches random-access memory (RAM), read-only memory (ROM), and electrically programmable memory (EEPROM) for controlling the operations of the massage machine and enabling the user to program specific additions to the software program. (Column 2, Lines 1-37 and Column 12, Lines 15-40). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to modify the device of Kikumoto to include different memory types, as taught by Cutler to increase the functionality of the massage machine.

As to Claim 11, Kikumoto discloses the massage machine is a chair-type massage machine (Figures 1 and 2) having a back rest portion (13), in which a massage head for providing a massage action is incorporated (21), and said massage parameters comprises the kind of massage action, range of massage action, the number of massage actions, massage strength, and massage speed. (Paragraphs 0068-0070).

### ***Response to Arguments***

7. Applicant's arguments filed July 28, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant asserts the prior art made of record does not disclose or teach a massager where the user can fully adjust or modify the individual massage parameters of the massage program stored in the memory. Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's assertions. Applicant's claim language simply states the step of "modifying the desired massage state according to the change in parameter." However, there is not statement as to the ability of the user to fully adjust the massage parameters. As such, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). In regards to the prior art, the massage parameters are changed in response to the user selecting the mode of



massage operation as addressed in Paragraph 0068-0070, and Figures 10a, 10b, and 15. The user selects if they are relaxed, active, or in pain and the massager runs the appropriate massage parameter stored program wherein the repetition and duration of massage movements are imparted on to the user. Thereby, enabling the user to meet the claim limitation of modifying the massage state according to the change in massage parameter. Thus, in light of the aforementioned reasoning the rejection of the claims has been maintained.

### ***Conclusion***

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Annette F. Dixon whose telephone number is (571) 272-3392. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Justine Yu can be reached on (571) 272-4835. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Justine R Yu/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3771

Annette F Dixon  
Examiner  
Art Unit 3771

/Annette F Dixon/  
Examiner, Art Unit 3771